

SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD KIVA - CITY HALL 3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD APRIL 6, 2006

APPROVED 04-20-2006

PRESENT: R. Littlefield, Councilman

Jeremy A. Jones, Vice Chairman

Eric Hess, Commissioner (arrived 12:34)

E.L. Cortez, Design Member

Michael D'Andrea, Development Member Kevin O'Neill, Development Member

ABSENT: Michael Schmitt, Design Member

STAFF: Lusia Galav

Greg Williams Mac Cummins Sherry Scott Kim Chafin Wendy Hardy Tim Curtis

CALL TO ORDER

The study session of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by at 12:31 p.m.

1. **REVIEW DRB CASES**

CONTINUANCES

2. 25-PP-2004 Redbird Property

CONSENT AGENDA

3. 4-DR-2005#4 <u>Dolce@ The Borgata</u>

Mr. Cummins presented material samples.

4. 93-DR-2005

4241 Winfield Scott Plaza

Ms. Chafin presented a material board.

In response to a question by Vice-Chairman Jones concerning the accuracy of the block colors which were depicted as gray and beige in different areas, Ms. Galav explained that the 8.5 X 11 elevation drawings do not accurately represent the colors. The 11X17 is more accurately represented the actual colors of the project.

Board Member D'Andrea asked for clarification concerning the section in the staff report under parking spaces which stated, thirteen required, five provided. Ms. Chafin explained that because of the parking credit, the actual requirement netted out to zero, but they are providing five.

5. 101-DR-2005

SL-12-Adobe Apartment-to-Condo Conversion

Mr. Williams distributed material boards.

Vice-Chairman Jones opined that the elevations did not correspond to the plans on many of the details and that there were no perspectives. He stated that he was willing to take into account the fact that it was a difficult project, in an area where renovation needed to be done but he was not comfortable that he knew what the buildings would look like. He requested that this item be moved to the regular agenda for discussion.

6. 104-DR-2005

The Peaks Business Park

Mr. Williams presented materials boards.

Vice-Chairman Jones requested that Mr. Williams review for the Board the status of the drainage study process. He noted that he had communicated with Mr. Williams previously about the situation because the report implied the drainage had not been worked out.

Mr. Williams explained that a drainage report had been performed previously by the commercial subdivision. The Applicant used that subdivision plats drainage report as a guide to do the current one. The previous project was just a plat and the drainage department felt the way the storm water ran through the property required some extensive studies. The studies had not been completed in time to include results in the presentation.

In response to an inquiry by Board Member O'Neill regarding alternative opportunities for the eastern driveway, Mr. Williams explained that it is a fixed driveway as per the zoning case. If it were moved further towards the residential to match up with the one across the street, it would be to close to the residential, if it were moved further away it would cause a private traffic issue.

7. 115-DR-2005 <u>Dicken Residence Remodel</u>

In response to an inquiry by Vice-Chairman Jones, Ms. Galav clarified that the Applicant would be adding a room above the living room in addition to the new roof.

8. 7-DR-2006 <u>Troon Highlands Estates Faux Cactus WCF</u>

9. 9-DR-2006 Sprint & Cingular Stealth Saguaro Cactus

10. 19-DR-2006 Chaparral High School WCF Relocation

Ms. Galav reminded Board Members that they had reviewed the case previously during a study session.

Mr. Curtis presented materials boards.

In response to a question by Board Member O'Neill, Mr. Curtis confirmed that the Scottsdale School District goes through the process as a courtesy, they are not required to submit plans. Councilman Littlefield explained that they are generally cooperative with any suggestions the Board may have.

11. 22-DR-2006 <u>Chaparral High School</u>

STUDY SESSION

1. Arizona Bridge & Canal Improvements (69-DR-2002)

Mr. Bill Pfeiffer with Capital Project Management addressed the Board. Highlights of his presentation included concept studies, the site plan, water fall plans, site materials, and plaza stones. The project was originally approved in January of 2003 and changes were being made in order to fit with the developments to the north and south of the canal. The primary change was from a pastoral type of atmosphere to a hardscape where people could gather with outdoor dining, jogging, and reading. He reviewed the additions and changes to the project and reiterated that they were only looking for a head nod from the Board because the project had previously been approved.

In response to an inquiry by Councilman Littlefield, Mr. Pfeiffer explained that one problem with the wall was that it could not be added to, but it could have a cantilever over it. He stated that SRP approved the concept on the north side and are expected to approve the proposed plan. Anything within 18 inches of the top of the existing wall would be allowed; SRP does all of their maintenance from within the canal.

In response to a question by Board Member Cortez concerning the overall review process, Mr. Pfeiffer explained that they attempt to deal with safety aspects and potential altercations. Concerning maintenance of the fountains, Mr. Pfeiffer clarified that the fountains would be maintained by the City.

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD/Study Session April 6, 2006 Page 4

In response to an inquiry by Board Member D'Andrea, Mr. Pfeiffer confirmed that the private developers to the north of the canal will have the flexibility to tie into the project. The plant palette and trail system are being used as a prototype. Board Member D'Andrea commented that the project has some nice elements.

Vice-Chairman Jones presented Mr. Pfeiffer with a copy of south canal bank patio design guidelines for commercial projects with his suggested changes for review. Councilman Littlefield requested that copies be provided to the Board Members.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

None.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the study session adjourned at 12:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, AV-Tronics, Inc.